



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Wessobrunn Prayer, 12%; Hildebrand's Lay, 17%; Muspilli, 28%; Judith, about 14%; Beowulf, 10%; Heliand, 20%; Vǫluspá, over 6%; Baldr's Dream, 8%; Guðrun's Lay, i, 15%.

These figures go to show that in none of the poems examined did the author purposely either seek to introduce or to avoid identical vowels, but that the average percentage is such as we would expect it to be from the nature of the case, and that Hildebrand's theory, which would lead us to expect a much smaller percentage, is not sufficiently supported by facts to warrant a rejection of the old view.

There yet remains one point to be discussed. Hildebrand quotes in support of his theory a passage of Snorri Sturluson's 'Háttatal' (Hafniae, 1848, ed. Arnarn, i. 596) to the effect, that "if the höfustaf be a vowel, then the stuðlas should also be vowels and it is *more beautiful if each one of them is a different vowel.*"

But I doubt, whether our author refers to æsthetic beauty at all, whether different vowels really caused a more pleasant sensation to his ear than identical ones. Much rather I am inclined to think, that he calls "beautiful" what he finds in the old poems, which he regards as faultless models. As is well known now, the vowel is not in such cases the alliterating element at all; but what really alliterates is the guttural explosive which precedes the formation of a vowel and is due to the opening of the vocal chords (the Greek smooth breathing, the Arabic hemza, the Hebrew aleph, etc.). We have seen, that in not more than ten to fifteen out of one hundred alliterating verses the vowels following the alliterating consonants are identical. The same, of course, will be the case with regard to the vowels following this guttural explosive; in eighty-five to ninety cases out of one hundred they will be different from each other. Sturluson knew nothing about the guttural explosive, he only saw that the different vowels at the beginning—as it seemed to him—of alliterating words were much more frequent than identical ones. Hence his conclusion that they were preferred, preferable or "more beautiful." If this be the case, his remark cannot be adduced in support of Hildebrand's theory.

HANNS OERTEL.

Yale University.

OLD FRENCH PHONETICS.

La méthode graphique appliquée à la recherche des transformations inconscientes du langage, par M. L'ABBÉ ROUSSELOT.

La Phonétique expérimentale et la philologie Franco-Provençale par M. KOSCHWITZ; contained in a reprint of the *Compte-rendu du Congrès scientifique international des catholiques*, tenu à Paris du 1^{er} au 6 avril 1891. Paris: Picard, 1891. 24 pp.

THE first of these two articles represents an address delivered by the Abbé Rousselot, co-editor with M. Gilliéron of the *Revue des Patois Gallo-Romans*, before the Catholic congress held in Paris during the month of April of last year. M. Rousselot dwells on the importance of a physical study of speech, which must form the basis of all historical study, and refers to certain mechanical appliances, invented by him and others, that register the movements which the different organs of speech undergo. This apparatus is of the most ingenious kind, and has been more fully described by M. Rousselot in the above-mentioned *Revue*, fascs. 14 and 15, where he also shows its possible application in a study of his native patois, that of Cellerouin. Not feeling myself competent to express any definite opinion on the matter, I would refer the reader to the article in question for further information.

Dr. Koschwitz continues the same theme, and speaks of the importance of such study as that undertaken by M. Rousselot, and emphasizes the fact, that every linguist, in order to be able to cope with the problems which he will encounter, must of necessity pay attention, and a great deal of attention, to the physiology of the organs of speech, and must "d'abord se faire naturaliste, physicien et physiologiste." These methods must at first be applied to the study of living forms of speech, and the information thus gained transferred to the study of the older stages of language. This leads him to speak of the difficulty which every student of French phonology experiences, when he endeavors to compare any modern dialect with the literary language, or with older dialects. The modern patois of Northern France have undergone so marked changes in their rapidity of growth under purely phonetic influences, analogical contamination, or mixture with

surrounding forms of speech, that the aid which they afford in understanding the older forms of language, is often very meager. On the other hand the curious phenomenon is noticed, that the further we proceed toward the South of the French linguistic territory, the more do we notice a certain lack of development and a tendency to retain older forms.

It is to be supposed that the Provençal kept pace in the beginning of its history with the speech of Northern France, but that it grew less rapidly, and doubtless, therefore, we shall often find the key to unsolved problems of the linguistic history of French proper in the patois spoken to-day South of the Charente. Hence, Koschwitz lays stress on the importance of these patois for the study of French, at least in those instances where other means at our disposal, such as the study of the orthography of old texts, the assonances and the modern *Langue d'oïl* dialects fail to give the desired light. To illustrate the helpfulness of such a procedure, he cites two knotty points of Old French phonology; namely, *l̃+s* and the history of the nasal vowels.

It is with regard to the former of these problems, that I desire to add a few remarks on the position taken by the writer. After a short historical sketch of the question, Koschwitz says, p. 16:

'On se demande quelle articulation spéciale une *l* mouillée prend devant une *s*; si elle produit nécessairement une explosive dentale entre elle et la consonne suivante; quelle influence le groupe *ls* exerce, et sur la nature des voyelles précédentes et sur l'articulation de l'*s* qui suit? Prononçait-on *s* ou *z* (*s* sonore)? Était-ce un *d* ou un *t* qu'on insérerait entre *l* mouillée et *s*? Est-ce qu'une *l* mouillée suivie de *s* dégage réellement devant soi un *y* qui se réunit avec la voyelle précédente et produit avec elle une diphthongue? Et si ce dégage-ment (qui n'a rien d'improbable) existe en réalité, peut-il se compliquer avec une action simultanée de *l* mouillée sur la consonne suivante?'

All these questions are identical with those to which I endeavored to find an answer in my study on 'Dialectische Eigenthümlichkeiten in der Entwicklung des mouillierten *l* im Altfranzösischen,' *Publications of the MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION*, vol. v, pp. 52-105. It is not my purpose here to repeat what I stated there, but it may be to the point to recall that

there exists one Old French dialect, which gives unequivocal answers to some of these questions; namely, the Wallonian. Here *l̃* is designated by *lh*; cp. "Poème Moral" *assalhe*, *batalhe*, *mervelhe*, *conselhe*. The inflected forms of words with final *l̃* always have *lz*, never *lhs*, *lhz* or *ilz*; cp. "Dial. Greg." *travalz*, "Job," *travalz*, "Poème Moral" *travaz*, *conselz*. Here, there certainly exists no *l̃* before the flexional sign, no parasitic *i* before the *l*, and a dental glide between *l* and *s*! But far from solving the whole problem, these facts only complicate it. Each French dialect requires separate study and a distinct answer of its own. On the whole, however, I think it may be confidently asserted, that a parasitic *i* did not develop before *l̃+s*. The inflected forms naturally follow closely the orthography of the uninflected forms, and if an *i* appears before *lz*, it is either merely graphic, or if pronounced, its presence is due to a pronounced parasitic *i* in the uninflected form. In some instances it is possible to follow its gradual inroads; cp. Rol. *-alz* twenty-three times, *-ailz* five times, O. Ps. *-alz* six times, *-ailz* one time; Eul. *melz*, Al. *vielz*, *mielz*, Rol. *mielz* seventeen times, *vielz* seven times, *vielz* five times, *mielz* two times, O. Ps. *vielz*, *mielz*, Q.L.D.R. *vielz*.

The problem, however, which calls for solution is the appearance of *z* as flexional sign in the Norman, Champagne and Lorraine dialects. The Wallonian cannot enter here, for there *z* is found after all *l̃*'s. In my judgment, there lies at the root of the whole matter an understanding of the way in which a dental explosive develops between *l* and *s*. Most varieties of *l* are produced by forming a stop with the point of the tongue against the gums or teeth, while the sides of the tongue are drawn away from the molar teeth, thus creating two symmetrical channels for the sound, (Jespersen's β_{iie}). If this articulation is followed by an *s*, the spirant formed by the point, or blade, of the tongue (and for the present purpose we may accept Jespersen's transcription, $\beta_{ie}y^{\beta_2}$), the tongue rests for a moment, when the *l* articulation is broken, in the position of a dental stop (β_0). If the *l* is voiceless and if its articulation is sufficiently marked in muscular tension (Gröber's *l fort*, *Z.f.R.Ph.*, vi, p.

486), this dental glide may develop to an independent stop; $\tilde{l}+s$ becomes $l-t-s$.

In the case of $\tilde{l}+s$ on the other hand, no such conditions for the spontaneous development of a dental explosive exist. Here the stop is effected by the front of the tongue against the hard palate, while the point of the tongue rests behind the lower teeth and does not participate in the articulation (*βeyii⁸*). Sweet, 'Handbook,' p. 44, suggests that in the first attempts to produce this difficult articulation the learner should hold the point of the tongue firmly against the lower gums, so that the front alone may articulate. From such a position the tongue can easily and naturally pass to an s without previously sounding a dental explosive, but this action does not preclude, of course, the possibility of an interposition of t between \tilde{l} and s . It is quite as easy to interpose a labial explosive; the question is merely, whether a latent dental explosive exists between $\tilde{l}+s$, as is evidently the case for $\tilde{l}+s$.

But we may go further, and suppose that the tongue does form a stop at the same place, where it divides the articulation for \tilde{l} , before it passes on to the dental spirant. In this case the only possible explosive is a palatal t' , (*βeyii⁸* becomes γo^8). Such an articulation would have a very decided influence on the following s , and would give to it a sound, which with Chabaneau I will call "un son plus sifflant"; perhaps "plus chuintant" would be a better term. Such a supposition falls, however, if z in Old French texts denotes ts .

Now, let us see what must be the action of the tongue in passing from \tilde{l} to s . In carefully pronouncing these two sounds in succession, it will be noticed that the first movement of the tongue consists in flattening out its sides to their natural position in close proximity to the molar teeth. The s cannot be pronounced at the same point as $s+\tilde{l}$, and there will next be felt a tendency to backward action of the tongue. At the same time it will take on the requisite sagittal narrowing for the s , even before that sound is reached, and the result will be a succession of consonantal noises which may be represented by $\tilde{l}t'js$. Of these, t' will be the least prominent, and the acoustic effect of the whole combination will be very

similar to $\tilde{l}js$. So much, I think, is plain, if $\tilde{l}z$ is to be similar in formation to lz , it could only have sounded like $\tilde{l}ts$, as Chabaneau correctly supposed. Such a pronunciation, however, would have burdened the language with two plural signs, \tilde{s} and s , the existence of which is not probable. I believe that the \tilde{l} was forced to assimilate itself to the following s , since the pronunciation of this sound was fixed for morphological reasons, and \tilde{l} being thus drawn forward out of its palatal position, as voiceless and *l fort*, lz was the result.

It will be in the highest degree interesting to possess accurate physiological descriptions of the pronunciation of $\tilde{l}+s$ in the present Provençal dialects. Professor Gröber in a private communication called my attention to the orthography of the 'Donatz Proensals,' published by Stengel, Marburg, 1878. The testimony which the orthography of this document bears, seems convincing for Gröber's point of view, and against my own statement, l. c., p. 103. We find there only lhz ($=\tilde{l}+s$), lz ($=ll+s$) and ls ($=l+s$). At the same time it must be noted, however, that the rules of the Donatz were, to say the least, not followed consistently by the Provençal poets; cp. Bartsch, 'Chrest. Prov.' *foills: oills* 135-27: 136-29; *dezacoills: capdoills* 137-6: 14; *orgoills: escoills* 137-21: 28; *vermelhs: soleths* 267-1: 2; *viels: miels* 392-13: 14 (and in the same poem *conselh: espelh* 391-11: 12). These are to my knowledge the only rhymes of this kind in the Chrestomathy. But if the 'Donatz Proensals' really represented the actual use of the writers, is it not strange that so large a collection of poems as that of Bartsch presents no rhymes in accordance with these rules?

I shall not attempt an explanation of Prov. lhz ; but, at the same time, I think it is evident that the l in the combination lz in later French was not a palatal \tilde{l} , for it could fall or vocalize to u , just as every other \tilde{l} . We have, therefore, to grant a fronting of the articulation for some stage of the history of the language; that this fronting took place in such a way that $\tilde{l}s$ became ls and then lts (lz) I consider, with Gröber, extremely improbable. I believe rather that $\tilde{l}t'js$ changed to lts under the influence of the dental s , which had a fixed

pronunciation, since it was the plural sign of the language, and in this manner I desire to modify my opinion as stated, l. c., p. 103.

A priori, the Provençal can no more give definite answers to questions of French phonetics, than can the Wallonian to those of the Norman dialect; at the same time, a better understanding of all the possibilities of phonetic development and of the actual facts in the existing patois south of the Charente, must necessarily be very helpful in a consideration of general phonetic problems. I shall await with great interest some realization of the hopes of Professor Koschwitz.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Johns Hopkins University.

ANGLO-SAXON READER.

An Anglo-Saxon Reader, edited, with Notes and Glossary, by James W. Bright, Ph.D., Associate Professor of English Philology at the Johns Hopkins University. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1891. 12mo, pp. viii, 385.

It would be ungracious, to say the least, if the writer of this review, who for ten years has been teaching Sweet's 'Anglo-Saxon Reader,' should utter a word of disparagement about it. Sweet deserves the heartiest thanks of every one who has to do with the Philological study of English; and if now and then he has put forth bitter words,—as in the preface to his 'Oldest English Texts,'—who can deny that he has had abundant provocation? Good as his work has been, however, I am inclined to think that the best results will be obtained by our ordinary college classes here in America, if we use from the start the Cook-Sievers 'Grammar' and this new 'Reader' which Professor Bright has just presented to his colleagues. Such a combination insures thoroughness, and yet offers no sharp or sudden difficulties. The phonology in Sweet's 'Reader' is neither detailed nor exhaustive, and is distinctly difficult; and there is a crowded, abrupt fashion in his treatment of the inflections which gives needless trouble. Compare, for instance, his treatment of adjective stems,—where *ēce* is ranged quite without explanation of the reason, under the "short" declension,—with the lucid statements of Sievers.

Let these books, then, be used from the start. The primer or "beginning-book" is of doubtful benefit; a student who is ready to study Anglo-Saxon at all, is quite prepared to use the regular grammar. The time allotted to our subject in any ordinary college course is so meagre that a teacher must in most cases aim at rapid work and speedy results. A dozen paradigms and a few hints on pronunciation give the student basis for translation, which should begin at once; progress thereafter should be marked by three features:—careful translation, with grammatical analysis working gradually up to the difficulties of inflection and phonology; reading at sight; and composition. The last feature is probably neglected in most of our classes; but visitors or members of Professor Zupitza's *Seminar* at Berlin will recollect how much stress is laid by that admirable teacher upon a facility of translating from the vernacular. Passages are given in German to be translated immediately into Anglo-Saxon,—a discipline of evident value. Indeed, a booklet of materials for such exercises would be a goodly offering for some one to make to his profession: not, of course, that we could expect the young lions of original research to hunt this ignoble quarry, but peradventure there be humbler who have borne the burden of instruction and are willing to minister to the lower needs.

To come closer to the subject of this review, I believe that Professor Bright's book will forward the study of Anglo-Saxon in general, and will be a friend and aider of those who would have modern English kept in communication with its chief and proudest sources. For while the university teacher may look forward to a doctor's degree for his pupil, and may insist upon a thorough knowledge of every inch of ground in the field of Old-English philology, it is the problem of teachers in the ordinary American college how they shall make most profitable to the student the hour or two weekly, for perhaps a single year, which he devotes to this study. We tell such a student that his brief course in Anglo-Saxon is not an "intellectual luxury," but rather an almost necessary condition of appreciation in his estimate of English history, English literature and the English tongue. To read in the